

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, capital \$1,000,000. Office: 400 Broadway, New York City. Telephone: 400-1000. Second-class postage paid at New York City, N. Y., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Please send address changes to The Tribune, New York City, N. Y.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

One Year, \$10.00; Six Months, \$6.00; Three Months, \$3.50; One Month, \$1.00. Single Copies, 5 Cents. Delivery by carrier, 10 Cents per copy. Outside of Greater New York, add postage.

ADVERTISING RATES: Daily, 10 Cents per line; Sunday, 15 Cents per line. Long copy, 5 Cents per line. Display, 10 Cents per line. Classified, 5 Cents per line. Special rates for large advertisers.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

More "Copperheadism."

It is a poor argument that has to be based on epithets. "The World" accuses us of Copperheadism because we fail to accept its view of the super-eminent merit of Mr. Wilson's foreign policy. It says that the United States must settle its controversies in the field of foreign relations either by diplomacy or by war. That is axiomatic. But it wrongly assumes that Americans are therefore debarré from criticizing the kind of diplomacy which this Administration has succeeded in making famous. It is irritated because the critics of the Wilson foreign policy will not agree with it that the diplomacy which Mr. Wilson has employed has been in itself either wise or suited to the exigencies of the situation.

We know a good deal less about Copperheadism than "The World" does. In Civil War times it was the chief organ of Copperheadism in this city. If we were now in a state of war criticism of the government which might give aid and comfort to the enemy would be inadvisable. But we are not at war. Whatever the Administration may wish, its foreign policy has become the biggest issue in the Presidential campaign. If that policy has been wise and right—the only possible policy under the circumstances, as "The World" thinks—the issue ought to be welcomed by the Democratic party, which is going to try to reflect Mr. Wilson.

Says "The World": "But what is the view of those who have criticized Mr. Wilson's foreign policy unless it is the view that we have relied upon diplomatic negotiations to maintain rights which should have been upheld by blood and iron?" That flatly misrepresents the issue, as The Tribune pointed out on Saturday last. The President's critics do not attack him because he has relied on diplomatic negotiations to maintain American rights. He didn't confine himself to mere diplomacy. He also experimented with "blood and iron" at Vera Cruz. Yet if he had maintained American rights, either by diplomacy or by "blood and iron," there would be no criticism of his policy to-day except from the out-and-out pacifists.

The real indictment drawn against his policy is that it did not maintain rights either by note-writing or by acts of violence like the seizure of Mexico's chief seaport. His policy has become a reproach not because it was either diplomatic or because it was at times belligerent, but because it was insincere, vacillating and futile. It has had no purpose except to avoid responsibility and to delay definite action. It has never accomplished anything, chiefly because it never meant what it said.

In Mexico our diplomacy should have had but one aim—to protect American lives and property. But that aim was subordinated at the outset to the side issue of boycotting Huerta. Then another side issue intervened—the restoration of land ownership to the submerged peons. After Huerta's fall there was a sudden shift to the idea of absolute non-interference with the Mexican factions while they were trying to "determine their own form of government." Finally a new interference was attempted for the purpose of forcing Carranza's retirement from the Provisional Presidency. That failing, Carranza was recognized.

But all the time Americans were being murdered and American property was being destroyed. Not a hand was lifted to enforce American rights, while blood was spilled and an enormous amount of energy was being misemployed in trying to regulate the course of Mexican politics.

Is it Copperheadism to say that the Wilson programme in Mexico, whether restrained or not restrained within the bounds of diplomacy, was a complete and shameful defeat?

So far as Germany is concerned, it is equally foolish to say that no American can criticize Mr. Wilson's activities without being either a cowardly Copperhead or an advocate of war. The United States is not seeking war; neither can it run away from war, if its own rights and interests are attacked. If the Democratic party wants to support a policy whose only test of success is in avoiding war at any cost, Mr. Bryan is its logical leader, not Mr. Wilson.

So long as the United States pursues manfully and consistently its historic policy of protecting American citizens and defending neutral rights, the issue of war and peace cannot rest entirely in its hands. We are subject to attack by those who deny our rights, and even Mr. Wilson has said that such an attack may come at any moment.

What the critics of Mr. Wilson's German policy complain of is that it has not maintained American rights; nor has it even forestalled the possibility of war. The resident has not tried to put the country into that condition of military security which it would feel no hesitation about testing American honor and interests, whatever the outcome. He has left the nation defenseless, while writing notes to

Germany which, if they meant anything, should have meant that the threats contained in them were to be backed up by force.

The people of the United States do not want war. But they value national honor beyond prosperity and material success. They have looked for a policy of firmness on the part of the Wilson Administration and have gotten only a policy of glittering phrases and Dead Sea fruits.

The country now demands a policy in accord with honor and American traditions, whether it brings war or maintains peace. It cannot be put off with the argument that if we are going to rely on diplomacy for a while longer we must accept Mr. Wilson's diplomacy without question as the only escape from war. We refuse to believe that even barring the alternative of war (which no diplomacy nowadays can bar) almost any other diplomatic policy would have carried us further than Mr. Wilson's programme of military unpreparedness at home and shifting and turning abroad.

If it is Copperheadism to condemn the Wilson policy for lowering American prestige and belittling American courage, let the President and his supporters make all they want to of that terrible accusation in the press and on the stump.

Not Yet Cleared Up.

Mr. Shonts has made a detailed and smooth explanation of the phrase "commitments and obligations" which came to light in the Young-Lane memoranda regarding the contract for third-tracking the elevated lines. He has denied that there was any sinister favoritism in his advocacy of the Stevens contract; he has testified that Mr. Lane, the chief proponent against it, admitted complete confidence in his personal integrity, but couldn't "say as much about some of your associates." He has even gone so far as to urge the executors of the late Mr. Lane to make public any papers or documents they may have bearing on this point.

There still remain certain points on which the Thompson committee must require further light. One of these is why Messrs. Lane and Read retired from the Interborough directorate, after manifesting their suspicions about the contract under consideration. Another is how the protests against this contract got the idea that Mr. Shonts or Mr. Stevens or Mr. Freedman was to benefit personally by it. Mr. Shonts's testimony does not make the record complete by any means. Mr. Freedman is dead. Mr. Lane is dead, but something may be gained from his papers. Mr. Read, fortunately, is alive, and from the description Mr. Shonts has given of him, should provide entertaining testimony. Mr. Young still has a story to tell, undoubtedly.

Mr. Shonts's explanation of "commitments and obligations" should be flanked in the testimony by all the information the minority at that time in the Interborough can give about this mysterious phrase.

Unjustifiable.

Even the most persistent adversary of the corporation and the capitalist must admit that there is some merit in the argument against the Philippines scuttled made by Mr. Charles M. Swift, president of the Philippine Railway Company. He represents two enterprises in the islands, the Manila Electric Railroad and Light Company, which he admits is tolerably successful, and the Philippine Railway Company, a struggling concern. "In both cases," he tells the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, "the investment made by myself and associates was in response to invitations coming from Washington. Not one of the men who risked his capital would have taken a share in either enterprise if it had been proposed to launch them on any but American soil." But if the scuttles actually occur, the Philippines will no longer be American soil, and Mr. Swift declares, "our securities will not be worth 10 cents on the dollar. The result will be tantamount to confiscation of nine-tenths of their value."

No one familiar with conditions in the Philippines can doubt the truth of that statement. To exclude the Philippines from America would be to depreciate, if not to destroy, every American investment there. This, perhaps, one of the smaller phases of the issue, but it is not unworthy of serious consideration. It involves the good faith of this nation toward its own citizens. For months America has been trembling on the verge of a war with Mexico to protect the lives and property of its citizens in that foreign country. If interests of Americans on foreign soil deserve such paternal care, what of the interests of Americans on American soil? To desert them under pressure of necessity would be bad; to desert them needlessly unjustifiable.

Trousers for Women.

The Rev. Dr. James E. Norcross, of the Shady Avenue Baptist Church, Pittsburgh, thinks women would be happier in trousers. "The women I saw in San Francisco's Chinatown," he is quoted as remarking to his audience, "were attired more sensibly than their Occidental sisters, and they wore something very like trousers. When God gave folks legs he intended them for use, and if all women adopted the masculine attire used by their sisters in mountain climbing they would feel better."

Mr. Harry Leon Wilson has written entertainingly on this point in a late issue of "The Saturday Evening Post." He puts into the mouth of Ma Pettengill some words of wisdom which the Rev. Dr. Norcross might well ponder. "Freedom from skirts," I says (she was addressing Miss Hetty Tipton, her protégée), "is the last thing your sex wants. Skirts is the final refuge of immodesty, to which women will cling like grim death. They will do any possible thing to a skirt—slit it, thin it, shorten it, hike it up one side—people are setting up nights right now thinking up

some new thing to do to it—but women won't give it up and dress modestly as men do because it's the only unfair drag they got left with the men."

What possesses the Pittsburgh divine to believe that women seek physical comfort in dress? It is comfort of mind they are after, and that can come only with the knowledge that what they wear is creating the intended impression. Squeezed into corsets of reinforced concrete, hobbled and helpless in narrow skirts, their feet tortured in tight shoes, they can yet remain radiantly happy, conscious of profitable martyrdom. This for them is the peace that passeth all understanding, all masculine understanding.

"Little Navy" Psychology.

The suspicion is growing that not a few of our "little navy" Congressmen oppose the growth of the navy through jealousy—jealousy of the importance of anything about which they are totally ignorant. Take, for example, the Hon. John R. Connelly, of Kansas, a new member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House. Mr. Connelly wrote a constituent not long ago that should the United States be invaded the inhabitants of the Atlantic seaboard could retire behind the Alleghenies and those of the Pacific Coast behind the Rockies and live out their lives in perfect security. More recently still, at a committee hearing, he inquired of Rear Admiral Grant, commander of the submarine fleet, if torpedo boat destroyers were intended to chase and destroy torpedoes.

Now, at home in Colby, Kan., Editor Connelly has a certain reputation to maintain. There are fellow townsmen there who on observing him about to enter the editorial offices of "The Colby Free Press" are given to exclaiming: "There goes John Connelly—what he don't know ain't worth knowin'." It seems only natural and human, therefore, that Mr. Connelly should maintain a bearish attitude toward things naval. The navy to him belongs in the category of things that "ain't worth knowin'" and he would keep it in its place.

Representative Oscar Callaway, of Comanche, Tex., is another new member of the Naval Affairs Committee whose feelings are those of Mr. Connelly, only Mr. Callaway likes to make interesting naval suggestions, such as that battleships should carry submarines lashed to their decks to the scene of battle and that they should fight head on rather than broadside to broadside. If only the navy might be composed of prairie schooners, what enthusiasts these gentlemen would become! But then, of course, their peculiar fitness for membership on the Naval Affairs Committee would be at an end.

For the Suppression of Bad Art.

Men of fastidious taste are beginning to show signs of uneasiness at the prospect of an explosion of art when hostilities are over, and so conscious are they in England of the dreadful consequences of unpreparedness for war that a few of the choicer spirits have already banded themselves in a determined effort to provide against the disasters of peace.

The Civic Art Association might have been founded at any time, its avowed objects being to promote the use of arts and crafts for all sorts of civic purposes and to support all efforts to beautify cities, towns and villages by the employment of artists and craftsmen. But in establishing it now while the war is in full swing the promoters are fully conscious of the peculiar dangers that threaten the cities, towns and villages of their native land. They foresee the great demand there will be for memorials of all sorts, and as the Lord Mayor of London observed in the course of the inaugural address, "the very notion that the country might suffer, as in the past, from a multiplication of memorials which were ugly, trivial and commonplace was enough to fill them with shame and alarm."

Lord Beauchamp, one of the founders, intimated that they were not concerned merely with local and parochial affairs. Among the monuments to be expected was one expressing the undying gratitude of Britain to France, and it would hardly suffice to have this done in the perfunctory way of an ordinary English monument. England is so loaded with eyesores already that if the Civic Art Association can do anything to regulate the inevitable demand for national, regimental and personal memorials it will earn the gratitude of future generations. If it cannot do much in the way of creation, it may, nevertheless, justify its existence by wholesale repression.

Chancellor Day, of Syracuse University, in referring to the movement for preparedness, says: "This was overdone in Europe, and it should teach us a grave lesson." The good doctor is evidently one of those who believe the pun should be mightier than the sword.

The capture of Erzerum pales before that of Ignatius T. T. Lincoln—in the opinion of the captive.

City of Mosh Stormed—Headline. How the Russians must have breakfasted!

Luxury.

How little it becomes us now, when burns Our Mother world, in fiddles and in wine To fritter our high birthright! What divine Spark is left in us now? What man discerns The grandeur of the good old times or learns Aught good of us? Our gifts are noble, fine; Yet Man may give and gobble with the swine, Blind to God's sword, his own ancestral urns!

Luxury in her thousand landaulets, Serene in cushions, is full fair to see; But we of old have known her and her nets Ignoble to enslave whom God made free! God help the fallen nation that forgets! She is the death-bed of Democracy! EARL SIMONSON.

DISPUTED 'PHONE BILLS

A Grievance of Subscribers Called to Senator Thompson's Attention.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I have been a close reader of the investigation of the Thompson committee into the affairs of a certain large corporation. I am a citizen, a taxpayer and the sole lessee of three prominent Broadway corners. The little introductory regarding myself is to try to prove that I must have a certain amount of good sense and judgment and be ready to abide by the laws and regulations of the City and State of New York, its individuals and corporations. But I honestly and firmly believe there is one corporation, the New York Telephone Company, that is getting away with financial murder on its subscribers.

You enter into a contract with this telephone company, accepting contract from them that you know will cover your proportion of business, as you buy anything else necessary for your business. You receive a monthly statement for your contract proper, which is O. K. But in the left hand corner of this statement every month is a "little joker" for extra calls at five cents each. I have repeatedly asked for an itemized statement of so-called extra calls, not even contracted calls being used, according to my record, kept in each store. The company refuses to send the itemized statement, saying that the peculiar mechanism of their register makes it impossible to render itemized statements to subscribers. In other words, the register only keep books one way, theirs.

Is the New York Telephone Company of more importance to the community than the Consolidated Gas or Edison Electric? These corporations are compelled by law to install meters with instructions for reading same to subscribers, and the telephone company gets away with the cry, "Meters or registers are too expensive. We are impregnable; we are complete; you must pay for the extra calls or we will discontinue the service," which they do after accepting payment for regular contract service.

I took this matter up with the Second District Public Service Commission, and the letter I received from them would indicate that they were entirely helpless. They had received and seemed to have learned by heart the poor telephone company's side of the story.

A prominent lawyer in this neighborhood made an issue with them on this matter a few weeks ago, and they quit cold, saying, "Well, how many extra calls do you think you had?" He said, "None," and they settled on that basis.

Controller Travis made the New York Central Railroad render itemized statement of Governor Whitman's trip to San Francisco fair. Is the New York Telephone Company any bigger than the New York Central Railroad? WILL J. O'Hearn.

New York, Feb. 15, 1916.

"We Want Roosevelt."

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The favorite sons, the two spots, have descended into the obscurity from which they sprang, and those who are determined to resist the obvious are now supporting Charles E. Hughes for the Republican nomination.

While yielding to no one in my admiration for Justice Hughes, I fail to see what qualifications he possesses for the Presidency in these troubled times. Undoubtedly from the politician's standpoint he would make an ideal candidate. Having expressed no views on the vital issues of the day he has antagonized no one, and so would be all things to all men. The hyphenated element would support him as a protest against the harsh words in the Wilsonian notes to Germany, while those who are disgusted with an administration which has not hesitated to sacrifice the nation's honor to partisan advantage would support him in hope of a change of policy.

But the important question is what kind of a President would he make? Does he believe in effective preparedness? Does he believe in a vigorous foreign policy? And if he so believes, has he the qualities of leadership and statesmanship to make his creed practical and effective? There is no certainty on these points, and I submit that this is no time for experiment. We should take no more chances. The Republican candidate must be a leader of known views and a statesman of proved capacity. Courage and wisdom of the highest order will be required of our President if the problems which the next four years will bring are to be solved aright.

Those of us who believe in the old Americanism which was not "too proud to fight" and who wish our country to regain the place among the nations which it held on March 4, 1909, have no doubt as to who our next President should be. For us Representative Gardner has spoken: "We are tired of vague statements and beating around the bush. We want Roosevelt for President."

JOHN FRANCIS CURRAN.
New York, Feb. 14, 1916.

Ecclesia Militans.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Over a year ago the Bishop of London compared the world war to a fair and square fight between spirited schoolboys, and England and Germany to the two champion fighters. "When the fight is over," observed his lordship, "we shall shake hands again and be all the better friends." When I held office at Queen's College, London, with which Bishop Ingram is closely associated, he was revered by all students, who are composed of many nationalities. They loved him for his personal charm and excellent qualities of character, and not the least for that rare absence of insular prejudice which he had learned to merge in that higher patriotism which voices and mirrors the Christian spirit of universal sympathy.

Bishop Ingram served as a chaplain with the British forces in France, and the horrors of war are apt to engender bitter feelings in the best of us. German and Turkish newspaper critics should, therefore, not be too severe on the kindly prelate because he recently rebuked the enemies of his land for "killing chivalrous warfare." The remark would certainly have been better unsaid, since it is the supreme task of the Christian clergy to promote good will between the belligerent powers rather than add fresh cuts to the bleeding wounds.

ERNEST P. HORRWITH.
New York, Feb. 10, 1916.

"Less Heroic than Habitual."

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The basic difference between Woodrow Wilson and Roosevelt is that of the atmospheres in which they have had their being. T. R. has always had to "make good"; Woodrow taught school.

Now that the current has set in for the country's big man, some of the Republican "leaders" who were out of town (and are yet) when the Germans attacked us, but were always there when Mexico was mentioned (unlike T. R. they lack the courage to suggest an intervention) are willing to compromise (1) and name a Progressive Republican unless Hughes will save them.

Any well-trodden man will compromise unless he's a hero. And the G. O. P. "leaders" are less heroic than habitual. BROOKLYN, FEB. 13, 1916. A. A. G.



PAYING THE PRICE

The Humiliating Condition to Which President Wilson's Policy Has Brought the United States—Still More to Pay in the Future—The Danger of War Is Not Averted.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Many of our people continue to congratulate themselves on the fact that they have been kept out of the war. Few seem to give heed to the price that we have paid for securing that privilege. Some of us believe it to be far greater than any we should have been called upon to pay had we taken the risk of being drawn into the conflict because of standing firmly for what we knew to be the moral right of nations, instead of evading every moral issue, as the present government has done so consistently.

What is the price we have paid? It is to have acquired the enmity of the most powerful military despotism on earth and lost the friendship and gained the contempt of every other nation. Does any one believe that to have done these things is to have averted the danger of war? No one who uses his mind can think so.

No one will deny the truth of the following statements: International law and treaty rights were self-confessedly set at naught when Germany invaded Belgium. The people of the last-named country, civil as well as military, were treated by the Germans with a cruelty never surpassed in the warfare of savages.

Our own people have been killed while travelling on peaceful errands on unarmed merchant vessels, some of which have been sailing under our own flag, some of them under that of one or another of the countries at war with Germany.

An underground warfare has been carried on in our own territory by agents of Germany, in the course of which some of our people have lost their lives and the property of others has been destroyed.

To add to the significance of these crimes, in so far as they relate to the attitude of our government, our women have been outraged and our men killed in Mexico with impunity ever since this administration has been in office.

What has the government of the United States done in the face of these crimes? Nothing! Nothing of a decisive nature! Nothing that promises their cessation! Until eighteen months after the beginning of the war the President confined his activities to the writing of diplomatic letters, not one word of the demands contained in which has been taken any steps to make operative. He has counseled us "to maintain our peace," "to think neutrally," which is to say to think not at all. He has told us "that a man may be too proud to fight," when his own people were being killed before his eyes. He has informed us that "this country has nothing to do with the war"—a war in which every national ideal, every free institution, every sacred principle of our national life, is being attacked and threatened with extinction by the greatest military despotism on earth, and defended by the people of the countries who hold dear the same principles of human liberty as we have always held dear; a war in which, should Germany be the victor, our own national existence would very presently be exposed to her attack. And we are told that this war has nothing to do with us by the man who is at the head of our state, who, whatever else he may lack, is not defective in knowledge of the world's history and cannot claim ignorance as an excuse.

Thus have passed the first eighteen months of the war, so far as we are concerned—passed in condoning the smashing to bits of international law; in condoning the murder of our own people on the high seas and in Mexico, and in allowing to gather headway the underground warfare conducted on our territory by the agents of Germany, who have added to the items of the list of our dead and of our properties destroyed.

So much for the time until Congress assembled. Then at last the President awakes to the fact that more and more of our people are no longer willing, out of respect for his office, to remain silent and patient under the humiliation to which he has subjected them by this course of evading all moral responsibility, and comes to the realization that he is inviting disaster and defeat for himself and his political associates at the next election if he does not adopt a new one. So he

makes a flying trip to the Middle West, and there exploits as his own views those he has borrowed from his political opponents.

After eighteen months of absolutely neglecting all means of national defence, we find him now loudly proclaiming the immediate and pressing necessity of supplying them. We see him employing his persuasive powers of speech, which are beyond question great, in giving voice to principles that he has utterly disregarded until now, and which he should have voiced at the very outset of the war, and assuring the people that he has the honor of the country—to which his every act has proved his indifference hitherto—at heart before all else. In the course of his speeches he does not, however, hesitate to contradict his past actions and even his immediately preceding words with a fine disregard of their significance. He says on one occasion, "The country may be involved in war at any time," but in the next breath he tells us that nothing new has arisen which gives him cause for this special anxiety to-day. Yet again, in close juxtaposition, we are informed that the situation is not what it was a year ago. Just which one of these contradictory statements he would have us believe it is impossible to say, but we all know, and he knows as well, that the situation is to-day what it has been from the first day of the war. There has been no change. International law has no been repaired at the hands of those who smashed it to pieces. The murder of our people has not been disavowed. Outrages continue to be perpetrated upon us in Mexico. Underground warfare continues here on American soil.

But there is one thing that has changed. It is a change that has taken place here at home, and it is the only one in the situation. It is that the President's failures to act and his acts have, little by little, come home to the understanding of the people. They have ceased to "think neutrally," to be dumfries in his hands. And it has become evident that he is to go down along with his associates in disgrace if he maintains the course he has thus far followed. Hence this sudden change of front concerning national defence and other factors of the situation.

But even in this, his latest change of front, the utter lack of sincerity or reliability has been clearly shown when put to the very first test: for when the plan which emanated from his Secretary of War, and which he has been loudly supporting in his tour in the West, is attacked by a committee of Congress he immediately abandons his stand taken within a few days preceding, and allows the strongest man in his Cabinet to resign, the latter not being able to countenance further a vacillating lack of policy.

Will those who are always clamoring that "safety first," "point out the way to safety," has been secured by the course taken by our government? Kept us out of war? Why, it has done its very best to involve us in war. For it has made the country appear like a schoolboy who is forever trying to escape an attack by one or more of his fellows by slipping through every and every avenue of escape that he can find. That is what the President has made the world believe that this country has been busily occupied in doing during this war. Who has ever known of a schoolboy who "pointed out" by all his schoolmates? So, too, will it be with this country, which the President has placed in precisely the same position.

Perhaps it may be pertinent to ask, in concluding this letter: Just how do those who have lent their enthusiastic support to the policy of the President formerly, when it was absolutely opposed to what he says his present attitude is, reconcile their support of him now with that which they formerly gave to him?

FRANCIS S. WATSON.
Boston, Mass., Feb. 13, 1916.

The New Freedom at Sea.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Can you or any sane person explain how a rule that merchant ships should be compelled to stop and be searched and torpedoes at the will of any German submarine commander would make for the "freedom of the seas"? It does not sound to me like any kind of "freedom."

E. D. M.
New York, Feb. 14, 1916.

"A TRULY BRITISH SUCCESS"

Opinions on Britain's Failure to Cope with Germany's Publicity.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Regarding your able editorial in The Tribune of to-day I fancy that you misapprehend the British attitude in the premises. I imagine that my own opinion of the American people is largely the opinion of the British generally, and we think that the Americans are very much like ourselves and would resent any attempt on the part of a foreign potentate or agency to influence American opinion by newspaper appeals. Instance: the most powerful campaign matter in favor of the Conservative party in the last Canadian election were the Hearst papers, with their editorials in favor of reciprocity, freely circulated through Canada. The Americans are very well informed as to the major issue in this war, and the American sense of perspective will scarcely permit American opinion to be led astray by a red herring dragged across the trail in the shape of freedom of the seas, however the German statesmen may reiterate the cry.

Nor will American common sense fail to understand that in throttling German commerce there will be accidental and sometimes necessary interference with neutral trade, but the slight disadvantage to American interest will be overbalanced by the triumph of those principles of universal liberty for which the American people have always stood.

In a matter of this kind I fancy that American common sense needs no instruction from either England or Germany.

H. B. HETHERINGTON.
New York, Feb. 15, 1916.

Not a Fire Eater.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In your editorial "The Issue" like many of its predecessors, you constantly repeat your dissatisfaction with what Wilson has done because of the violation of Belgium's neutrality and the sinking of the Lusitania by the Germans. As far as I can see you cunningly omit to propose what you want us to do.

Should you now propose a step or more in any direction please be sure to add to it the advantage which you expect the United States (not you alone) to derive. That is very important.

My idea is that because a very few persons in the United States are waxing fat by selling war materials, etc., to the English allies, the balance of the American people must be the servants also of the English allies and do as they are told.

I fail to find any important instance where the English allies have sustained any protest or claim which we as neutrals made for ourselves relative to our rights under treaties, conventions, international law, etc.

A true blue American, but not a fire eater. JULES CHOPAK, JR.
New York, Feb. 16, 1916.

"Italy and Serbia."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: You will greatly oblige me if you will publish in your columns to-morrow the following declaration:

In the letter written by Mrs. F. C. Fay, and published on the 18th inst. in The Tribune, under the heading "Italy and Serbia," I accept responsibility only for that part which has been published in inverted commas, and which was really written by me. The statement made by that lady purporting to be a conversation held with me does not express my views in any way.

CHEDDO MIYATOVICH.
Former Serbian Minister in England.
Washington, D. C., Feb. 19, 1916.

Should Be Read by British.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Let me thank you for your admirable leading article in to-day's issue. It is one of many illuminating editorials written by you since the beginning of the Great War. Would to heaven it might be read by some of my British compatriots with power to do, and not merely to say! It will not be my fault if it is not.

R. C. RATHBORNE.
New York, Feb. 15, 1916.